

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(sparta01.005)

5 **Applicant:** Flam **Paper No.:** N/A
 Application No: 10/036,591 **Group Art Unit:** 2176
 10 **Filed:** 11/7/01 **Examiner:** Robert M. Stevens
 Fax: 571-273-8300

Title: *Graphical User Interface for Automated Process Control*

15 **Commissioner for Patents**
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

OK to enter
per RCE filed
9-18-06

Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 to a final Office action in an RCE

20 **Status of the prosecution**

Applicant received a final Office action on 6/2/05 in the above patent application in which all claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over the combination of Texier and Schultz. Applicant's attorney responded by arranging an interview which was held July 7, 2005 to discuss the claims and the references and then filing a traversal of the rejection on that same date. Examiner replied with an Advisory Action in which he maintained the rejection. Applicant thereupon filed a Request for Continuing Examination including a Submission in which claim 1 was amended to better distinguish it from the references. Applicant received a first Office action in the RCE on 11/8/2005 in which Examiner stated

30 ... Applicant's amendments to the claims significantly change the scope of the claimed invention as a whole. As such, Applicant's arguments concerning the previous rejections of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been rendered moot. (Office action of 11/8/2005, §5)

35 and then rejected the amended claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over two new references, U.S. Patent 5,586,039, Hirsch, et al., *Computer-aided manufacturing support method and system for specifying relationships and dependencies between process type components*, issued Dec. 17, 1996 (hereinafter "Hirsch") and U.S. patent 6,201,996,